

To: Vaughn, Stephanie[Vaughn.Stephania@epa.gov]
Cc: Willard Potter[otto@demaximis.com]
From: Robert Law
Sent: Fri 5/17/2013 7:57:31 PM
Subject: Fwd: RE: RM 10.9 Waterline Setback
[PipeProfile_OldPipe.pdf](#)
[PipeProfile_NewPipe.pdf](#)
[4-B-25.TIF](#)
[UWJC_Nutley_Passaic_Wmain.pdf](#)
[Water lines wrt right of way.pdf](#)

FYI.....don't look at it until Monday....

>>> <James.Brinkman@CH2M.com> 5/17/2013 2:34 PM >>>

Attached are the as built drawings with and without the dredge elevations on them as well as the planview of the water lines. I have also included a figure which indicates that the water lines may not be aligned with the right of way

From: Robert Law [mailto:rlaw@demaximis.com]
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 2:12 PM
To: Brinkman, James/BOS; McCreedy, Roger/DAY; Willard Potter; Stan Kaczmarek
Cc: Foster, Gary/ATL; Hicks, George/CHC; Claussen, John/BOS; mab.consulting@verizon.net
Subject: RE: RM 10.9 Waterline Setback

When were the lines installed?

>>> Willard Potter 5/17/2013 1:48 PM >>>

Roger:

Focus on volume - what is the volume with 30 foot setbacks per the letter? two 6 ft. pipes + some distance between them + 30 ft setback on each pipe.

When could we get the pipe locator survey scheduled and done?

BP

>>> <Roger.McCreedy@CH2M.com> 5/17/2013 1:39 PM >>>

Bill,

I just called Rajiv Prakash from JCMUA and they have a 40 foot wide easement. He did say that Stephanie called him yesterday. He told her that his drawings show that the pipes could be relatively shallow 3-5 feet, but she said based on dredging records from the 1930's that she thinks they are deeper. Rajiv will send Stephanie the as-builts that CH got from JCMUA and reviewed. Rajiv told Stephanie that the JCMUA already reduced the offset.

Jim already did some quick calculations see below.

So if you would have to dredge the entire 'no dredge zone' 2.33 feet

The No Dredge Zone as it currently is configured (50 ft offset) has an area of 24,146 ft² so the estimated volume would be approximately 2,087 yd³ (3.3 extra days)

Quickly costs for this increase include:

- Dredging & Delivery = \$88,280 (based on \$42.32/CY)
- Stabilization = \$323,678 (based on \$112/ton and 10% PC addition)
- T&D = \$477,764

Also need to include costs for:

- Water treatment
- Lining and tarping
- Cap components
- Water Quality Monitoring

Total increase would easily be over \$1MM

Capping costs to follow.

From: Willard Potter [<mailto:otto@demaximis.com>]

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:21 PM

To: McCreedy, Roger/DAY; Stan Kaczmarek

Cc: Robert Law; mab.consulting@verizon.net

Subject: RE: RM 10.9 Waterline Setback

Importance: High

Roger:

Can Hill run some numbers on the volume left in place with the current setback - make some spacing assumptions.

BP

>>> <Roger.McCready@CH2M.com> 5/17/2013 1:12 PM >>>

Bill, some of us are available at 3pm ET will that work?

From: McCready, Roger/DAY
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 1:03 PM
To: 'Willard Potter'; Stan Kaczmarek
Cc: Robert Law; Mike Barbara
Subject: RE: RM 10.9 Waterline Setback

Let me talk with the team and we can talk later this afternoon. This is a bad precedence!

From: Willard Potter [<mailto:otto@demaximis.com>]
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 12:56 PM
To: McCready, Roger/DAY; Stan Kaczmarek
Cc: Robert Law; Mike Barbara
Subject: RM 10.9 Waterline Setback
Importance: High

Roger/Stan:

Ray Basso just called Mike B. and stated that he's considering changing his mind about the current dredging set-back specs for the United Water lines running through the RM 10.9 Removal Area. He thinks that the pipes should be deep enough to clear the nav channel and dredging over them should not be an issue. Ray may be responding to NJDEP pushback on the proposed no-dredge zone in the Final Design (and taking sides??).

Can we get a conference call setup ASAP to discuss this afternoon? We will need to prepare for

discussions with EPA next Monday.

Thx,

BP